Caste Hindus and Harijans (clash in Doddaganjur, Chintamani Taluk).

Q.—532. Sri A. MUNIYAPPA (Sidlaghatta-Chikballapur — Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was a clash between caste Hindus and Harijans in Doddaganjur, Chintamani Taluk, on matters relating to religion;

(*b*) whether it has come to their notice that the taluk police officers are remaining indifferent without taking any steps though complaint was lodged with them;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the Commissioner for Depressed Classes went to the spot and enquired into the affair;

(*d*) whether they have taken any steps against those that have acted contrary to law in this connection?

A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) and (*b*) Both the parties have filed criminal cases. The matter is *sub judice*.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) *Vide* answer for (*a*) and (*b*).

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS TO COVER EXCESS EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1950-51.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We shall now go to the next item of the business in the Agenda.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I beg to move that the Excess Expenditure for the year 1950-51 may be taken up.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—It is the duty of the Finance Minister to move the adoption of the Excess Grants. I would like to know if the Finance Minister will be here. If you are going to permit the Education Minister to deputise for him, so far as the House is concerned, we would like to have the Finance Minister amidst us.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I am sorry, I have to disappoint him in his attempt to express his love for the Finance Minister. I am acting for him and I request the Leader of the Opposition to extend the same affection to me.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—In my case, love is not blind.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is discriminatory. It is not allowed by law. Sir, I am moving for the consideration of the Excess Expenditure for the year 1950-51. In this connection, I wish to refer to one or two factors. I invite the attention of this House to page 6 of the Appropriation Accounts, 1950-51 and the Audit Report for 1952. On page 6, the total amount voted for the year is shown as Rs. 24,17,75,500. There were Supplementary Appropriation Acts one of which was for Rs. 71,21,200 and another for Rs. 2,12,02,565. The total amount is Rs. 27,00,99,265. The aggregate disbursements amount to Rs. 22,19,25,431, leaving a minus balance of Rs. 4,81,73,834. Taking the total expenditure for the year, the Government have not spent anything in excess of the total amounts voted. That is one point which has to be kept in mind. The other point is that these are accounts for 1950-51. The amount has been spent and in the Budget of the subsequent years, while showing the actuals, these figures have been shown. The point of view is that these facts have already come to the notice of this Hon'ble House and they had their opportunity to make observations thereon. In this connection, the practice is that the discussion would be on the reasons for the excess expenditure, and in view of the discussions that have already taken place while submitting the budgets of the previous year, I submit, Sir, that the discussion might be limited and a time might be fixed. One other observation I wish to make is that the Demands have been noted in a list which has been distributed. I submit, Sir, that general discussion on all the items might take place and the amount asked for voted because they have already been spent and they had come also under the purview of this House. With these

remarks, I move for the approval of the Excess Expenditure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it the opinion of the House that all the demands can be discussed together ?

MEMBERS.—Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know the opinion of the House as to the time that has to be allotted for this? Because, as has been already stated by the Hon'ble Minister, this is only to regularise the amount spent during 1950-51 and this is also borne out by the Audit and Appropriation Report and also by the Public Accounts Committee Report which has been placed before this Hon'ble House. Therefore I do not think much time is required for discussing this grant.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—There cannot be any limitation of time like this. This is a very important demand. They have placed this demand for giving our approval to an amount which was spent about 4 or 5 years ago. There are fundamental principles involved in this. Therefore no time-limit can be fixed. I am sure the Hon'ble Members are aware that there has been an inordinate delay on the part of the Government in presenting this Report to the House.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We welcome the criticisms by the members. The only thing is that time may be limited so that we may conduct the other legislative business.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I know Sir, the members of the Executive are in the same position as I am, because they are not concerned with this account ; and I do not know how they are competent to reply effectively ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Government is running the institution, we have to reply and we are going to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Shall we take it that we can limit the time till lunch hour ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So much of time may not be necessary because we are not going to improve the matter. Is that your opinion ?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I know you are not going to improve it, but we have to suggest remedial measures and see that such mistakes are not repeated. It is not desirable to limit the time so far as financial matters are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Therefore I say that any statement to be made, may be made up to 3 O'clock.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—May I suggest one thing, Sir ? It may not be necessary to go so far. I think it may be limited up to 2 P.M. I will leave it to your discretion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರು ದುರ್ಗ).—ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲ 5-5 ನಿಮಿಷವೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯೇ ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂ.—ಬೇರೆಯ ವಿಷಯ ವಾದರೆ ಪರವಾಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು financial matter ಆಗಿದೆ. When we have to vote to the extent of more than a crore, it is necessary that we should be given some time. Of course, members on this side take care not to waste any time. Generally I do not approve of the time limit being fixed on financial matters.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA ((Periyapatna).—I would like to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Member to Rule 133 where it is clearly stated that even in regard to financial matters, the Chair has got power to limit the time.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The Chair has got powers to limit the time. Further, both my friends on the opposite side and also on this side know that these are very old accounts and we are going to post-mortem those accounts. Regarding the suggestions that will be made, they will be most welcome. In fact the Audit Report has come in 1953. It has been considered by the Public Accounts Committee in 1954. It will not be necessary either for this side or that side to waste time over it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I object to the use of the words 'waste time'.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Spending excessive time over it may not be useful. The time can be better conserved for better and useful purposes like transacting legislative business.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ನಾಯ್ಡು (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರ).—ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ chance ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have considered the statements made by the Hon'ble Members and the Leader of the Opposition. I want to limit the time so that more members may be given opportunity to speak. Hon'ble Members are not going to improve the position of expenditure or cut down the expenditure; perhaps they will make some statements in the matter of not bringing it on the floor of the House at the required time. That is all.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA (Sagar-Hosanagar).—We make certain observations regarding particular items of excess expenditure and we must say for the future guidance of the departmental heads that such things should not recur.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is way I said that members are not going to make a detailed speech. They will make only observations with regard to the amount spent and why it was not regularised then.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Supposing the amounts are ill-spent ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That also can be said in one or two sentences.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We have already covered a substantial portion of it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

" That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,38,800 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of ' Land Revenue '."

I request the Hon'ble Member to be brief.

***Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T.-Narsipur).—I rise to oppose the Demand, Sir. I oppose it on a matter of principle. Even though under Article 205 sub-section (1) para (b), the Rajpramukh has the right to place the Demand before this House and regularise the excess expenditure over the voted grant, I feel, Sir, that to place such a Demand after five years, is not correct. This procedure is in vogue in other parliaments too. In Great Britain also, this procedure is in vogue. If the Government spends anything in excess of the voted grant, those Governments have the power to place a Demand before the Legislature in the following year. Here the Government have taken five years to place it and ask us to regularise it. I consider this to be irregular. Sir, the Appropriation Accounts for the years 1950-51 was no doubt considered by the Public Accounts Committee only last year and the Government may say, we have placed these demands before the Legislature as early as possible. The Public Accounts Committee of the State have considered the Appropriation Accounts in detail and they have made a recommendation in page 7 of their report to the effect that the excess demand or the excess expenditure might be regularised by placing a demand before the Legislature, and hence this demand is before us. This position can never be improved ; that is my point, because the Accountant-General has placed the Appropriation Account for the year 1951-52 very recently in our hands and it must be considered by the Public Accounts Committee. They will take their own time. By the time the Public Accounts Committee considers this report, it will be one or two years and the Government will place before us to regularise all such excesses if there are any, and the accounts of 1951-52 will be placed sometime in 1956-57. I want to know whether we can never end this difficulty. There is a lot of difficulty in analysing the expenditure of a period 4 or 5 years ago. If that system continues for ever in Mysore State, there will be no effective check at all. Therefore, I want to know whether the Government do not appreciate this point. They must get the Appropriation Accounts of the latest year—at least of the year 1954-55, and they must have it considered by the Public Accounts Committee and then place such demands before us. There is some meaning in that. But I consider there is absolutely no meaning in placing a demand for the expenditure incurred about five years ago and to regularise it now. It amounts only to

* Asterisk indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.

a farce. You are perfectly right; you are doing it under a provision of the Constitution, I do not deny, but the usefulness is marred. Therefore, I urge upon the Government to get the Appropriation Account of these years from 51 and 52 up to the last year early and place such demands before us.

Sir, now coming to the point of the demand for the excess expenditure for 1950-51, the excess is very large. Out of 50 or 56 demands of Government, the report says that in 17 cases, the excess is of the order or 1,27,61,000 over the voted grant. So, I want to know whether there was any Budget at all? If the Government had an idea of how much they had to spend under each head, then would have so occasion to place such expenses as are placed before us now in the nature of a budget; we took nearly 20 days to pass the demands then.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I may bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Member, that the account which is shown now as excess grant was shown as actuals in the subsequent year when the Budget was presented.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, I may straightaway point out that every rupee of the Consolidated Fund can only be spent on a vote of this House. The mere mention of this in subsequent years does not authorise the Government to regularise the expenditure. Otherwise they could not have brought it. Why did they bring it here? They could have as well done it by themselves. The point is, it was brought to the notice of the House only to regularise it. My only point is, there is delay and that must be reduced.

And second thing is, if suppose there is an excess of Rs. 1,27,000,000 in respect of 17 demands only, I cannot really understand why they provided so much under this demand. I cannot really understand what they mean by placing a demand before us. My point is, when the Budget presented, Government was, with the best of information they had, placed the demands before us and in the course of expenditure there might have been excesses, but they must bear some proportion to the original grants. Such a huge excess is never permitted and can never be tolerated. They must present the Budget Estimates and then get the approval of this House. Why did they spend 15 days in discussing every demand? We had so many cut motions. Therefore, I consider, Sir, that the Government should take better care when preparing estimates, so that they can avoid such excesses. That is my point.

Now, Sir, I will illustrate further.

1-30 P.M.

Sir, may I point out how the budgeted expenditure has suffered a fall in actuals in these years? Now, I spoke about the excess in respect of a particular demand. I will now place before this House how in all these four years, from 1950-51 to 1954-55, there has been a short-fall in the budgeted expenditure. To both I object; I object to the short-fall and I object to the excess. I object because the short-fall and the excess must be within a particular proportion. It must be within a particular limit. It should not exceed a particular percentage of variation. That is my belief. If a thing is allowed to vary one hundred per cent, then budgeting has no meaning. I admit that there must be some percentage of variation. I will just place before this House how it has happened. In the year 1950-51, as the Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say, an expenditure of 27 crores was budgeted but the actual was only 22 crores. There was a short-fall of 5 crores, coming to nearly twenty per cent of the total estimates. That is a very wide variation. In 1951-52, the budget estimates were 36 crores, and the actuals were only 24 crores. There was a short-fall of 12 crores coming to thirty per cent variation. In 1952-53, the figure was 27 crores and the actuals were only 23·7 crores. There was so much of a short-fall. It is not that I dislike short-falls. But the Government must be in a position to place before us a certain definite estimate. As the very word implies, it is an estimate. As with an estimate, it will have certain variations. But this variation must be within a particular percentage, and not such a huge percentage. In 1951-52 I may

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)
point out what the Auditor-General himself has said. We are dealing with only 50-51, and I have here the report of the Auditor-General of 51-52. I will tell you what he has to say. He says that out of 54 grants for which we have voted, for which appropriations have been sanctioned, in the case of only one demand the estimate is equal to the actual. In respect of 27 cases, the excess is ten per cent. The excess of expenditure . . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—This probably is an effective answer to your criticism. We do not spend money.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I am not entering into rupees, annas and pies. I am discussing the policy, the principles that the Finance Department has to adopt. I am not interested about rupees, annas and pies today, because I am dealing with the policy.

Sir, in four cases, the actual expenditure is equal to one hundred per cent over and above the voted item. In one case, the expenditure has exceeded one hundred per cent of the voted demand. So, there must be limitations. I will come to that. Why has Government not been able to give us an estimate to vary with the marginal percentage of variation ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Will the Hon'ble Member say whether this peculiarity pertains only to this Government, or whether such a thing exists elsewhere ? I know that even in western countries such things do happen. Take out and see.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I have already answered that question. In other Governments where there have been such variations, such variations are regularised in the following year. In the British Parliament that is the procedure. In India . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Here, what has happened is this. The Public Accounts Committee Report was sent very late . . . .

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Let them answer it, Sir. That is my criticism of policy which I have offered. I am placing it before the Government.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—May I know from the Hon'ble Member whether there was consolidated fund that year ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I will tell you.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The system of budgeting was quite different from what it is today. There was no such thing as Consolidated Fund or Contingent Fund.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I am glad that my Hon'ble friend has raised that question. He agrees with me when I say that in that year there was the system of placing the demands before the Legislature and getting their vote. What I am attacking is that system. The Consolidated Fund has come into existence from 1st April 1951. That is the date of financial integration. I am talking of the Consolidated Fund. Even in that year, which my Hon'ble friend has mentioned, there was the system of placing the demand before the Legislature and getting their vote.

Now the Executive has spent much more than what was authorised. That is the irregularity. I am now coming to the question as to how best it could be solved. That is my suggestion to the Government. If the Hon'ble Member wants to know anything more, I am prepared to tell him to the best of my knowledge. Now, Sir . . .

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—What is the marginal percentage of variation reasonable in your opinion ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In my estimate, I feel that a variation of five per cent can always be accepted.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is your opinion.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—It is absolutely my opinion.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—In your opinion five per cent is reasonable. If five per cent is reasonable in your opinion, twenty per cent may be reasonable in my opinion.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I welcome the Hon'ble Member's opinion that in his opinion twenty per cent is reasonable. Certainly. But I would hear him in silence.

In a way the Hon'ble Member has interrupted me and I want to make one

thing clear. He was pleased to remark the other day that we are here at the courtesy of the Congress. Let me humbly place before him that it is not so.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—What I said was that if the Electrical Strike had not been controlled by the Congress Government, probably we would not have been here. Because the Congress Government did protect, you are here on account of the Congress.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In the democratic set up, I am as much responsible for the good administration of the State as he is.

I was coming to the question of how to keep down these variations. This opinion has been expressed by the Auditor-General too. The Head of a Department having control over the expenditure asked for a particular grant and when the grant was voted by the Legislature, he could not keep a check over the flow of expenditure. If supposing he had that check, it might have been possible for the departmental head to keep the expenditure within the voted grant. For every department there is a departmental head. It is the departmental head that has to spend the money. Unfortunately, he has no control over the flow of expenditure. Therefore, if we evolve a system by means of which the head of a department will be in a position to control the expenditure and be within the voted grant, then, I think we could reduce the variations.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—He cannot avoid.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—He cannot. When there is an excess of expenditure, he can still ask for supplementary grants and get the same voted. I think the control of expenditure by the heads of departments is very essential. Unless we get that, it may not be possible for us to keep the expenditure down to the voted amounts.

Sir, the Hon'ble Minister referred to Consolidated Funds. In the face sheet of the memorandum it is stated that the accounts of the State have to be maintained in three categories. (1) Consolidated Fund in the State. (2) Contingent Fund, that is established, and (3) Public Accounts. It is also stated in the face page that the opening balance of these accounts have not yet been fixed. I think Article 266, sub-section 1 and sub-section 2 defines the Consolidated Fund and the Public Accounts. Article 267, sub-section 1 defines contingent fund. Under the Constitution there is provision for the creation of the Consolidated Fund of the State and I submit that the opening balance of that fund has to be fixed. The Accountant-General has stated that it is not possible for him to fix the opening balance of the Consolidated Fund, the Contingent Fund and the Public Accounts. Public Accounts is held by the Government in the nature of trust. Expenditure out of that fund may not be proper. The Consolidated Fund is the correct fund that the Government should appropriate. The Appropriation Bill seeks authorisation to spend within the Consolidated Fund of the State. The expenditure out of Consolidated Fund is done by means of legislation of this House. To appropriate funds of the Public Accounts—I think, Article 283, section 1 lays down the principle that the operation of that fund is also subject to the enactment of this House. Now, Sir, because we are holding a combined balance for all these three accounts, only one Appropriation Bill is placed before us and we are regularising. I think we must press upon the Accountant General and the Controller to bifurcate and to fix the opening balance of these funds. Anyway, it has not been done in India. It is difficult. It will only come in when we attempt to bifurcate the audit from accounts. It may mean a little extra cost. But we can approach the Government of India and obtain financial assistance to bifurcate audit from accounts, and then only people will know what they have and how much they can spend. This is one point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕನ್ಸಾಲಿಡೇಟೆಡ್ ಫಂಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಂಟಿಂಜೆನ್ಸಿ ಫಂಡು ಎಂದು ಇದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, there is another thing I want to place before this House. No doubt, expenditure is under parliamentary control. There is absolutely no doubt about it. We have all discussed these demands and the Government cannot spend even a rupee out of the Consolidated Fund without satisfying us. But there is another aspect. There is the revenue side. There has been a fall in revenue year by year. There have been additional taxation measures all these seven or eight years, ever since the Congress assumed power. From 46-47, up to this day, there has been about ten to twelve additional taxation measures and their realisation may perhaps come to the order of five crores as I said the other day. In the existing heads of revenue I feel there has been a fall. That fall in revenue has not been effectively checked. The Auditor General says that it is not open to him to check the fall in revenue.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, on a point of procedure, I wish to submit that while discussing on excess grants, the practice is that we have to confine our remarks to that particular item. It is not a general discussion on the Budget, because we will be traversing the very same ground.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I entirely agree with you, Sir. It is only as regards excess. I was just placing some observations before this House so that the finances of the State may improve. If it is purely a technical objection, I will close and sit down, and I thank you.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ (ಮಳವಳ್ಳಿ—ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ Excess Grant ನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು 1950-51ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಶಃ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೆ ಇದು ಬೆಳೆದು ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಲಾಯರುಗಳು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ routine administration ಮತ್ತು account ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಗುಟ್ಟು ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಇದ್ದ ದೆಸೆಯಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೂಡಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದಿಗ್ಭ್ರಮೆ ಇತ್ತು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಧೈರ್ಯ ಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಧೈರ್ಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಧೈರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—Nation Building Activities ಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ.—ಆಗಲೂ Nation Building Activities ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದವು. ಈಗ 50 ಲಕ್ಷ-100 ಲಕ್ಷ ಖರ್ಚು ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಲೆಖ್ಖಾಚಾರ ಬೇಡಿ. Constitution ನ್ನಿನ 260 Article ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರ್ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಈಗ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿವೇಕ ರಹಿತವಾದ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರಲ್ಲ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—He has not said so.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ.—ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ನಾನಾಗಲಿ ನೀವಾಗಲಿ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ನೀವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೂ ಅಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ.—ಯಾರೋ ಕಳ್ಳರು ದೋಚಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರೆ, ಆ ಕಳ್ಳರನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು, ನೀವೂ ಅಲ್ಲ ನಾವೂ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The question of responsibility does not arise. I never said it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ.—1950-51ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಮಂಜೂರು ಆಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. Itemwar ಇಷ್ಟಿಷ್ಟೇ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೊಂದು ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ 28 ಲಕ್ಷ ಆಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಈಗ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಖಂಡಿತ Audit Report ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು strictures pass ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲವೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಒಂದು Finance ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು refer ಮಾಡಿ ತನಿಖೆ ಮಾಡುವ ತನಕ ಇದನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ—ಹೊಸನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, Appropriation Grantನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್‌ರವರು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ short-falls ಒಂದು percentageಗೆ ಮೀರದಂತೆ ಇರಬೇಕಾದುದು ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಉಳಿತಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು appropriate ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ಗಮನಿಸ ಬೇಕಾಗಿವೆ, ಅವು ಏನು ಎಂದರೆ estimate ಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕೆಲವುವೇಳೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು estimate ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ estimate ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಡುವುದು ಅಥವಾ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳಿಗೆ favour ಮಾಡುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ excess ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು, ಇಂತಹ irregularities ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇಂತಹ irregularities ಕುರಿತು

ತಾವು ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ Auditor-General observation ಮಾಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅಂತಹ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ನಡೆದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಏನಾದರೂ corrupt practice ನಡೆದಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಬೇಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ವರ್ತನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೀಗೆ excess ಆಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರಿಗೆ ಲಾಭವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟ ಬಾರದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಡಮಾಡಿ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗದೆ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಬಹುದು. ಈ ನೀತಿ ತಪ್ಪು; ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಕೆಲವರಮೇಲೆ ಸೇಡು ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ appropriate ಮಾಡುವಾಗ supplementary demands pass ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದಿಂದ, ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೋ ಆ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನೇಕ ತಡೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ Constitution ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು procedure ಇದೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. Excess ಆಗುವುದು ಸಹಜ. Excess ಆಗಲೇಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗದೆ ಉಳಿಯುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕ. Seasonal conditions ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಒಂದು contract ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದರೆ materials ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು Labourers ಸಿಕ್ಕದೇ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು, Tenders ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾರದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಮಂಜೂರಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಅರ್ಧಂಬರ್ಧ ನಿಂತುಹೋಗಿ ಹಣ ಉಳಿತಾಯವಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. Estimates ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಖಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಎಷ್ಟು latitude ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 100ರಷ್ಟು per cent ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೂ ಉಂಟು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು excess ಆಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ serious ಆದ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದುದು. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು estimate ಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಬಹಳ ಕರಾರುವಾಕ್ಕಾಗಿ estimateಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನೂ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಬೇಕು; ಮುಂದಿನ ವರುಷ estimates ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಾವಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ estimates ಮಾಡದೆ Budgetನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು Assembly ಯಲ್ಲಿಡಬೇಕು, Budget Estimates ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದೆ Representative Assembly ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರು ದುರ್ಗ).—Budgetನ ಮೇಲೆ general discussion ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—Excess shortfalls ಮತ್ತು preparation of estimates ಮೇಲೆ there should be effective control not only by the Government, but also by the Legislature which is the House which has got all the inherent powers regarding financial policies. ಮೂರು ಕಾಸನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯದೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ Ministerಗೂ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ provision ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ re-appropriate ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ರಾಜಪ್ರಮುಖರು ಅಥವಾ ಗವರ್ನರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಅದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ Assembly ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥ provision ಇದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ತಾವು ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಒಂದು ತಪ್ಪು ಮನೋಭಾವ ಬೆಳೆದುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ Budgetನ ಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತು finance matters ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಏನು ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ estimate ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಆಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕಳೆದವರ್ಷ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ estimates ಮಾಡಿದರು. ವರ್ಷದ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಹಣ ಬಂತು. ಅದು lapse ಆಗಿದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ, ಭಾವಿಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದು ಲಕ್ಷಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದೂ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. Industries Minister ನಾವು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ, ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಈ ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಈ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ excess ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ within certain limits ಖರ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದು. ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟು ತಡವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್‌ರವರು ಬಹಳ ಕಟುವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ account ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. Suppose the appropriation on a certain item is Rs. 2 lakhs and it was misused ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—Hypothetical ಆಗಿ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಯಾಕೆ "ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು"?

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to rules, we should restrict our discussion to particular demands.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಅದನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದು. Excess ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. 100 per cent excess

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.)

ಆಗಿರುವ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಕೇಸುಗಳಿವೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಆಗಿದ್ದು ಮತ್ತೆ 2-3 ಲಕ್ಷ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಹಣ deliberate ಆಗಿ misuse ಆಗಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ 5-6 ವರ್ಷಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದರೆ Appropriation Committee, Estimates Committee ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾರಮೇಲೆ ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು ಆಗಿದ್ದಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆ impeach ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು impeach ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್ (ಹುಣಸೂರು).—ಗೋವಿಂದನೇ ಗತಿ !!

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಶ್ರೀ ಅರಸರಿಗೆ ಗೋವಿಂದನೇ ಗತಿ. ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಿಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಇದನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ, estimates ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಯಂತ್ರದ ಮೇಲೆ control ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನರು ಮತ್ತು treasury ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ಜನರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ನಿಗಾವಹಿಸಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

2 P.M.

ಆಮೇಲೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ economyಗಾಗಿ ಅಂಜನಾಪುರದ ಫಾರಂ ಮತ್ತು ಬಿಳಿಕೆರೆ ಫಾರಂಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚಿದೆವು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇದು ಎಕಾನಮಿಯೇ ? ಫಾರಂ ತೆಗೆಯುವುದು ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೋ, ಮುಚ್ಚುವುದು ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೋ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಕಾನಮಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಒಂದು ನೆಪವೇ ಹೊರತು ಅದು ಕಾರಣವಲ್ಲ. ಇವು ಬೇಸಿಕ್ ಫಾರಂಗಳು. ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಸಮರ್ಥತೆಯಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಡಿಸಿ, ಕೊನೆಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಸಮರ್ಥತೆಯನ್ನೊಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಅವು ಉಪಯೋಗವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮುಚ್ಚಿಬಿಡೋಣವೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು 'economy' ಎಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿದರೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳೋಣ ! ಇಂಥವು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ನಡೆದಿವೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ನಮಗೂ ಕಣ್ಣಿವೆ, ಕಿವಿಗಳಿವೆ, ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದೇವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಷ್ಟು ಬುದ್ಧಿಯಿದೆ. ಬಿಳಿಕೆರೆ ಫಾರಂ ಮುಚ್ಚುವುದಕ್ಕೆ 'economy' ಯೆಂಬ ಕಾರಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರಲ್ಲಾ! ಇಂಥಿಂಥ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಕಾನಮಿಯ ವಿಷಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮನಗಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆದಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಲ್ಲೆವು. ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗಿಗೆ 50 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದಮೇಲೆ ತನಗೆ 60 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ, ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೈಯಿಂದಲೇ ಹೋಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟಾಕ್ಷಣ, ಆತನು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನುಷ್ಯ, ಸುಳ್ಳು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು excess estimate ಮಾಡಿಸುವುದೇ ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Nowhere in the world, not even in Mysore or in any other State. You are talking of something which is unheard of.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Don't you know that he is a poet.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Where is the practice of preparing an excess estimate ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿದ statement ಇದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ, ಅದು nowhere and in no country such an excess has been prepared . . .

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ).—ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಯಾವ ಲಂಗುಲಗಾಮೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆಯೇ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? 23 ಲಕ್ಷವಿದ್ದದ್ದು 50 ಲಕ್ಷವಾಯಿತು, ಈಗ 200 ಲಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಇಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಆಗುವುದನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ 51 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗಿಗೆ 61 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಂಬುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—The excess expenditure in a particular year does not depend upon the excess expenditure in a particular item.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I would have been in a position to say where this money flows and where the lacuna is. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will not allow discussion across the table.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I am addressing you, Mr. Speaker. ನಾನು ನಿಷ್ಪ್ರಾಣನಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ, ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಕಡೆ ಹೋಗಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಓಡಾಟಮಾಡಿ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಭದ್ರಾ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿದ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Member that he can refer only to excess items of expenditure. No other points need be brought to the notice of the Government.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I am talking within the purview of this Bill. ಸಿವಿಲ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ವಿಚಾರ ಇದು. Animal Husbandry ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನೋಡಬಹುದು. ನಾನು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೋ ಅದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದೇ

ಆಗಿದೆ. What I am talking is entirely within the purview of this Bill.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಬಾಬಿದೆ. ಎತ್ತುಗಳು ಎಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಬಿಳಿ ಎತ್ತೇ, ಕಪ್ಪು ಎತ್ತೇ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಎತ್ತರ ಎಷ್ಟು ದಪ್ಪ ಇತ್ತು, ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಕೋಣವೋ ಎತ್ತೋ— ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ relevant ಆದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳೇ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The excess grant is placed before this Hon'ble House after the matter was gone into by the Public Accounts Committee in detail; they have made several sittings and no wasteful expenditure, no uncalled for expenditure has been noted by them. I wish he had been a member of that Committee; then he would have gone into the matter and would not have brought—I may be pardoned if I were to say—irrelevant arguments which are outside the point.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—May I place before this House, that the Public Accounts Committee did not consider these things in detail? The Public Accounts Committee has simply made a recommendation that these excesses may be regularised. They have never bestowed any thought about the justification of these excesses.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—There is one thing, Sir. If there was any irregular expenditure, they would have noticed it. They did not notice it because there was nothing irregular.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—The Public Accounts Committee is not an all powerful body. If that Committee has submitted any report, it must come up before the Assembly. The Assembly is an all-powerful body.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The Public Accounts Committee is competent to get into every detail and satisfy itself. If they have not done it, I am very sorry for that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದು irrelevant ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಕೆಲವು ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರು. ಬಹುಶಃ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ 13ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ (4)ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಅವರು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ Demonstration and Experiments ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಕೆಳಗೆ

"....

Demonstration and Experiments

(3) Expansion of staff and purchase of additional cattle for intensive cultivation for which there was no provision."

ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ 11,618 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದೆ. ಈ ಎತ್ತುಗಳು ಯಾವುವು? ಅವು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯಬಂತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು, ಆ ಎತ್ತುಗಳು ಹೇಗಿದ್ದವು, ಎಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವು ಎಂದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister cannot be expected to know all those details about the bullocks.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಒಂದು ಸಲ ಟ್ರೆಜರಿಯಿಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಾವು draw ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಟ್ರೆಜರಿಯಿಂದ ಹಣ ತೆಗೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಎತ್ತಿನ ಬಣ್ಣ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಹಾಲು ಒಡೆದು ಹೋದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅತ್ತು ಕರೆದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ್ದೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ್ದೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಂದಂಥ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ದಾರರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದಂತೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ವಿನಂತಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಪಿ. ನಾಗರಾಜಮೂರ್ತಿ (ಮಳವಳ್ಳಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಿಳಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಹಣ ನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಫಲಿತಾಂಶ ಏನೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೂ, ಅದು ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಯಿತು, ಖರ್ಚಾಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅಂದಾಜು ಮಾಡಿದರು, ತನಿಖೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಿತು—ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತತ್ತ್ವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ಏನು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಉಪೇಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಲಾರರೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇದು 1951-52ರಲ್ಲಿ ಆದ ಖರ್ಚು. 'ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲೂ ಖರ್ಚಿನ ಅಂದಾಜಾ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ; ಲಕ್ಷಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಅಂದಾಜಾ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿತ್ತು', 'ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಆಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟರು, ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾಗದಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿನೋಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿತ್ತೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಎತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಮತ್ತು 16ನೆಯ ಐಟಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ 6,14,800 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು 9ನೆಯ ಐಟಂನಲ್ಲಿ Animal Husbandry ಮತ್ತು Agriculture ಎಂಬ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ 34 ಲಕ್ಷದ 64 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು—ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಪಿ. ನಾಗರಾಜಮೂರ್ತಿ.)

ವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂದಾಜಾ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಲಕ್ಷಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದರೇ? 1951-52ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕೂಡ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಹಣವನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಈಗ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಖರ್ಚಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ನಿಷ್ಪಕ್ಷಪಾತ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಂಶಯಪಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸಮಾಧಾನವನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಡವೇ? ಇದು 1950-51ಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಖರ್ಚು. ಹೀಗೆ ನೀವು ಕೋಟಿಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಸಮಾಧಾನವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ನೀವು ಒಂದು ಸಮಾಧಾನಪಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂಥ ಕಾರಣವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ (ಮೈಸೂರು—ಉತ್ತರ).—ತಾವು ದಯೆಯಿಟ್ಟು 17ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಓದಿ ನೋಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಪಿ. ನಾಗರಾಜಮೂರ್ತಿ.—ಹಾಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಸಮಜಾಯಿಷಿಯನ್ನು ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ನೀವು ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಾಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾವು ಈಗ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನೀವು ಎಂದೋ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಧೈರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ನೀವು ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ! ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಅಸಾಧಾರಣವಾದ ಕಾಲ ವಿಳಂಬ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಇನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕಾಣಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ; ಬಹುಶಃ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರೇ ಇಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಯಾ ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲೇ ಆ ಜಮಾ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳ ತಪಶೀಲನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಾವು ಇಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ತಮ್ಮ ಆದ್ಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಆ ವರ್ಷ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೀರಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಕಡೆಯಾಗಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಳೆದ ಮಹಾ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಮತ ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಆಗಿದ್ದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಊಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದವರು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಓಟು ಹಾಕಿದವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಕೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೇ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಾಕ್ಷೀಭೂತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುಂದು ಮಾಡಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಅನುಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವಕಾಶ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಾಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ತಳ್ಳಿಹೋದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭೆಯು ತನ್ನ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ನೀಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತೆಯೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ತೀರಾ ಅಕ್ಷಮ್ಯಕರವಾದದ್ದು. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದೇ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅವರು ಕೂಡಲೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಮಜಾಯಿಷಿ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I am indeed surprised at the way in which my Hon'ble friends have spoken on the demands for regularising the excess grants. The theory put forward by them that each item of expenditure has to be scrutinised and sufficient explanation should be forthcoming for all the items of expenditure is certainly to be accepted. But, Sir, either they have not understood the situation as it is or though they have understood the whole thing, they are trying to make use of this opportunity with a view to. . . .

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—To beat a dead horse.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If I could borrow his expression—I do not say it is to beat a dead horse—to sling mud. If it is merely to beat a dead horse, they would not beat it because they have abundant common sense. Sir, I am perfectly convinced that my Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar understands the position very clearly. But he has given unfortunately a wrong interpretation. He wanted to make it appear that these items were items of expenditure coming under extravagant expenditure. It is far from the truth.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I never said so. At no time have I said that the expenditure has been extravagant expenditure. I have never referred to expenditure.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Then I stand corrected.

Sir, if he had taken the trouble of going through these items, he would understand that in almost all the cases, the excess grant for which ratification is now needed is to be found with regard to the non-recovery of that amount within the time prescribed. I can only exemplify what the position is. I wish to draw the attention of this Hon'ble House to page 10 of the "Demands for Grants to cover Expenditure incurred

in excess of Voted Grants and charged Appropriations during 1950-51."

"The excess of Rs. 31,28,346 in gross expenditure mainly under heads '5' and '9' was reduced to Rs. 11,83,911 by larger recoveries amounting to Rs. 19,44,435 chiefly under the minor head '10'.

Similarly you can kindly see page 12:

"The original grant of Rs. 50,58,000 was increased to Rs. 52,57,000 by a supplementary grant of Rs. 2,00,000 to cover the probable excess under '4 Tools and Plant'. The saving of Rs. 61,360 in the gross expenditure for which minor heads '4' and '5' were mainly responsible was converted into an excess of Rs. 1,02,738 owing to smaller recoveries amounting to Rs. 1,64,098."

In most cases, it was due to small recoveries. In some cases the amount was not recovered from local bodies and district boards. It was not recovered from other institutions in certain instances. My Hon'ble friend Sri Gopala Gowda—unfortunately, he is not here. It is always good that when an Hon'ble Member makes a charge, it is much better he sits in the House and hears the other side, I won't say explanation, of the picture.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—We cannot allow that observation to go unchallenged. The Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda never knew that Sri Mariappa will take part in the debate and reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If he had remained, he would have heard the Hon'ble Member.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Even in the Parliament, Sir, when an Hon'ble Member makes a charge, he would sit in the House to hear the other side.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—We are here to take note of.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—On page 14:

"Due to (1) disposal of tractors and (2) non-adjustment of amounts from the Deposit head before the close of the year."

The excess is Rs. 1,78,573 and is due to non-accounting process. So also on page 15:

"Due to misclassification of certain items under this head instead of under '6 Post-War Development Schemes'."

Therefore the excess under this is Rs. 89,445.

Sir, on page 17 again under the major head "27A Animal Husbandry" it was converted into an excess of Rs. 34,64,294 owing to recoveries being less than anticipated Rs. 44,90,484."

I think these instances are enough to show that some items are mainly due to non-accounting process and others are due to recoveries being less.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—The excess is only 31 per cent.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The excess expenditure was incurred because there was no provision made. Sir, my friend was pleased to remark that the Public Accounts Committee did not go into this item in detail. Sir, it is a very strange explanation to be offered in this House. I think he was also a member of the Public Accounts Committee at some time or the other. Any item of expenditure where the Public Accounts Committee discovers an error, it is immediately noted. The explanation of the officer is immediately called for and with the adverse notes, the report is placed before the House. In all cases where it is mere irregularity, the attention of the House is drawn and here in this case as well, perhaps in addition to the observations made, the Public Accounts Committee has asked mere regularisation in the accounts procedure. Therefore is it open to them to criticise in this manner? They have got other occasions to criticise the Government. They can draw the attention of the Treasury Benches to the irregularities that are found in the way in which expenditure is being incurred. But in the case of excess grants, grants relating to 1950-51, unless they discover a very valid reason where perhaps there is a case of misappropriation sought to be hushed up,

(SRI T. MARIAPPA.)

it is only in such grave cases, if they have some evidence, they could air their views. In all other cases, even in Parliament, these things are automatically passed without comment being made. With these few words, I commend the demands for the acceptance of the House.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Sir, they have placed demands for grants for 1950-51 in 1955. The excess that was spent over the voted grants is about Rs. 1,27,63,400; This is a very staggering figure. Sri Srinivasa Iyengar has very ably pointed out how the incapacities and the inefficiencies of the then Government were responsible for such huge excesses. There should be some limit while spending moneys in excess over the voted grant. There should be some reasonable proportions. But here they have surpassed all reasonable proportions. And, as has already been pointed out, in certain cases, they have gone over one hundred per cent. Sir, such a way of accounting or such a way of spending moneys, in some cases not spending, as was pointed out by one of my friends yesterday, is not to be tolerated. That definitely shows the utter incapacity of the Government to anticipate the revenues as well as the expenditure for a particular year. In this case, after these defects were noted down by the audit, they have brought it before the Assembly for approval. In certain cases, the excess that they have spent is abnormal. For example, under agriculture and animal husbandry, the excess is Rs. 34,64,300.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It was explained just now.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Yes. I am going to offer some remarks on the explanation that he has given. Again, No. 16, Sl. No. 32 Industrial works—working expenses, they have spent Rs. 61,04,800. On irrigation works they have spent Rs. 11,84,000. Sri Mariappa gave a very astounding explanation regarding the notes on page 10, Grant No. 17, Irrigation Works. He said that the excess of Rs. 31,28,346 in gross expenditure reduced to mainly under heads 5 and 9 was Rs. 11,83,911 by larger recoveries amounting to Rs. 19,44,435 chiefly under the minor head 10.

2-30 P.M.

What he said goes against him and goes in our favour.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It does not go against me. On page 9 it will be seen that excess recoveries under establishment charges transferred from "24 Civil Works" amounted to Rs. 3,51,788.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—If the recoveries were not there, the excess of expenditure under that Demand would have been greater. Just because of recoveries, excess has been brought down to that figure. It does not mean that the excess depends upon recoveries.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You have not understood me.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—What he says, namely, that excess has been reduced, goes against him.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Anticipated recovery was Rs. 44 lakhs. But it has stood at Rs. 34 lakhs. So, there is less of recoveries. Otherwise, the whole thing could have been wiped out.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Under 'Pensions and Allowances', it is stated that Rs. 3,08,618 excess is "mainly due to retirement of larger number of officials than anticipated, revision of pensions consequent on the general revision of scales of pay and booking of pensions under this head of the Military personnel of the Palace who retired between February 1949 and March 1950 and pensions of retired employees of Railways for which no provision was made under this head." I would like to ask the Government why did they not anticipate the number of officials that are going to retire.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—But to say that it is wrongly spent is not correct.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Why did they not anticipate the number of officials that are going to retire on such and such a date and make provision for meeting the pension after retirement of those officials? Again, Sir, regarding Railway

employees, Railways have been taken over by the Government of India. Why should the Government of Mysore be asked to pay the pensions of those Railway employees ? Why should not the Government of India pay them pensions ? They have taken over an earning Department like the Railway Department, but still they ask us to pay the pension of those employees. On page 13, there are Rs. 2,02,662 excess expenditure on Demonstration and Experiments and it is stated that it is due to misclassification by the Department of certain items under this head instead of under '6. Post-war Development Schemes.' I would like to ask the Government why did they misclassify those items. Again they say due to non-provision for transport and incidental charges, etc., incurred by Multi-purpose Co-operative Societies, the excess is Rs. 46,256. Why did they not anticipate the transport charges or incidental charges that may have to be incurred by Multi-purpose Societies ? Again, due to expansion of staff and purchase of additional cattle for intensive cultivation for which there was no provision the excess amount was Rs. 12,728; due to disbursement of arrears of pay on account of general revision of pay scales, the amount is Rs. 2,676 ; due to payment of higher wages to labourers, the amount comes to Rs. 12,723 and due to payment of previous year's bills, the excess is Rs. 5,354 and net excess under other heads is Rs. 2,101 partly offset by non-payment of bills of firms before the close of the year owing mainly to belated supplies. I want to know whether there was no agreement between the Contractor concerned and the Government. Why did they not insist on the requirements by the Departments to be supplied in time ? They have given another reason for excess and that is due to winding up of certain experimental farms and units as a measure of economy. Here, Sir, I cannot understand why these farms were wound up as a measure of economy. They are by very nature experimental farms. These experimental farms are run for benefiting the agriculturists, those agriculturists that are interested in improving their agriculture, in improving their cattle wealth and who want to learn from these experimental farms. I would like to ask why should they wind up such experimental farms when they were really serious of opening these farms to educate the people. The Hon'ble Sri Channabasappa made unfounded, baseless and irresponsible allegations against me yesterday . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I strongly object to this. The Hon'ble Member cannot take this opportunity to retort to what he has said yesterday. Please stick to Excess Grants only.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—Excess behaviour ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is a discussion on the budget and not a discussion on previous day's subject.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—By the grace of Congressmen if we are here, I would like to warn him . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would say this is irrelevant; you can take another opportunity to ventilate your grievance or retort to the statement.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ನಿನ್ನೆಯಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಾದಿದ್ದೆ. ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not relevant here.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I must take the earliest opportunity of telling him that we are here by our own right and that we are as much representatives of the people as any body on the other side.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have understood their position. We want very effective opposition. Don't get flurried over this.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Sri Channabasappa asked Sri Srinivasa Iyengar as to what should be the percentage of variation regarding excess expenditure. We would like to tell him, as Sri Srinivasa Iyengar has already told him, that it should be somewhere about 5 per cent or 6 per cent. But under no circumstances it should amount to such a huge figure as minus Rs. 5 lakhs balance of a District Board of which the Hon'ble

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY)

Sri Channabasappa was the President. I therefore vehemently oppose these Demands.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು Public Accounts ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಮೆಂಬರಾಗಿದ್ದೆನು. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನಿಸಿತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಹಳೇ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಸಭೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಲು ತಡವಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿದೆ. ಅದು ಅನೇಕವೇಳೆ ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯ ಎಂದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಟೀಕೆಗಳು ಬಹಳಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ restraint ನಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—Responsible opposition restraint ಆಗಿರಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆಗ ಲಂಗುಲಗಾಮು ಇಲ್ಲದ ಕಾಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಲಂಗುಲಗಾಮು ಇದೆಯೋ ಆಗಲೂ ಅದೇ ಇತ್ತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—I am sorry, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ defence ಮಾಡದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದು ಅವರಿಗೆ credit ತರತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇಷ್ಟೇ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣ ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ತಾವು ಹಾಕಿರುವ 14 taxes ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಈ tax ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕಾಸೂ ಕೂಡ ದುರ್ವ್ಯಯ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸುಮಾರು $\frac{1}{3}$ ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—May I know the actual budget of that year?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—Foreign Scholarship ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. Revenue 3,38,000 ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—Foreign scholarship ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು Public Accounts Committee ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂತು. That is due to non-payment of foreign scholarships pending final settlement of accounts. 1951-52 ರಲ್ಲಿ Foreign scholarships ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸಂತೋಷಪಡುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ savings $2\frac{1}{2}$ ಲಕ್ಷವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅಂದಾಜು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದು ಆಗದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ bad budgeting ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಇಂಥದರಲ್ಲಿ savings ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ savings ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ savings ಆಗದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದೇ bad budgeting ಎಂದು ಅರಿಕೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು budget sanction ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ supplementary budget ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿ ಮೊದಲಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು bad budgeting. ದುಡ್ಡು ಸಾಲದು ಎಂದು supplementary budget ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, original grant ಗಿಂತ ಕಮ್ಮಿ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿಬಿಡುವುದೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು reckless budget ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಧಾನ.

ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಶೇಕಡ 50ರಷ್ಟು ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಚ್ಚಾಪಟ್ಟೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಐದು ವರ್ಷ ಕಳೆದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದರ ಖರ್ಚಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇವರ Explanation ಇದೆಯೋ ಹೊರತು, ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಗೆ, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವೇಳೆ Grow more food ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿ misclassification ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಒಂದರದನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದು—ಹೀಗೆ ಮನಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಮೇಲೆ adjust ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮ್ಮ Explanation ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. Sheep farm ಎಂದು ಒಮ್ಮೆ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸುವುದು, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದು—ಇದು ಇವರ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನ. ಅಜ್ಜಂಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮೃತಮಹಲ್ ಕಾಡುದನಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಧುಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೊರಟರು. 86 ದನಗಳು ಹುಟ್ಟಿದರೆ 286 ದನಗಳು ಸತ್ತುಹೋದುವು!

ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.—ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರೇ cattle improvement ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಕಾವಲು ಕೂಡ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರೇ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರಲ್ಲಾ!

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಮೆರಿನೋ ಕುರಿಗಳ ತಳಿ ಹೊಂದಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಟಗರಿಗೆ 1,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದರು. ಕುಣಿಗಲ್ ಸ್ಟಡ್ ಫಾರಂ ಕೂಡ ಹೀಗೆಯೇ. ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟಡ್ ಫಾರಂ ತೆರೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂತು, ತೆರೆದೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ಮುನ್ನೂರು ಎಕರೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿದರು. ನಮಗೆ ಕುದುರೆಗಳಿಂದ ಏನು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಕುಣಿಗಲ್ ಸ್ಟಡ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ರೇಸ್ ಕುದುರೆಗಳನ್ನು breed ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಕೂಡದು. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ breed ಆದ ಕುದುರೆಗಳನ್ನು 25,000, 30,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಮಾರಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಭವವೂ ಇದೆ. ಅವರೇ cattle breeder ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. Horse breeder ಅಲ್ಲ ಅಷ್ಟೇ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅನುಭವ ಇದೆ, ತಿಳಿದಿದೆ ಅಂದ ಮೇಲೆ, ನನ್ನ ಅನುಭವ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಅವರ ತಪ್ಪು.

ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಮಲ್ಟಿ ಪರ್ಪಸ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ಇದರ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಗೆಂಬುದು settle ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು plan ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್

ಫಾರ್ಮಿಂಗ್ ವಿಚಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಫಾರಮ್ಮಿಗೆ 25,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. I am referring to the extravagant expenditure at that time. ಅಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಆಗ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದರಲ್ಲಾ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 10ರಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಉಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಮುಂದಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಮುಂದಿನ ಜನಾಂಗಕ್ಕಾದರೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಅದನ್ನೇ ಪುನಃ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಟೀಕೆಯನ್ನು ಬೆಳಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಅವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು Regularise ಮಾಡಲೆಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಂದಿನವರಾದರೂ ಈ ಅನುಭವ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಲೆಂಬುದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, 1950-51ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯ Excess grants ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಟೀಕೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿದ್ದೆವೋ ಅದು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇವಲ generalised ಆಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಐಟಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಪುಲವಾದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಮುಂದಿನ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮುಂದಿನ ಉಪಯೋಗವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಟೀಕೆಯೆಂದರೆ ಕಾಲವಿಳಂಬವಾಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವುದು. ಇಡೀ ಇಂಡಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಇತರ ಯಾವ State ನವರೇ ಆಗಲಿ 1950-51ನೆಯ ವರೆಗೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ತಡವಾಗಬಹುದೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅದು ವಾದವಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆ ತಡವಾಯಿತೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವೀಗ Transition Stage ನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. 1951-52ರ ಅಕೌಂಟನ್ನು ಈಗ ನಾವು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ 1950-51ರ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಏಕೆ ಬಂತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಆಡಿಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಎಂಬುದು ಈಗ independent ಆಗಿ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಮಾಡುವ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಅವರು ಬರೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಂದ ಬಂದಂಥ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಹೋದವರು ಆಮೂಲಾಗ್ರವಾಗಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಎರಡು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿ ಯಾವ ಖರ್ಚು wasteful ಆಗಿದೆ, excess ಆಗಿದೆ ಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಅವರ ಮುಂದೆ ತಪಶೀಲುಗಳಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ತರಿಸಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಿದೆ, ಎಲ್ಲಿ ದಂಡವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಎರಡು ಮಾರ್ಗಗಳನ್ನೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸದೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಬಾಬಿನಮೇಲೂ ಆರೋಪಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು Variation Rates ಬಹಳವಾಗಿದೆ, ಯಾವ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೂ ಹೀಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಯಾವ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ratio ದಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು fix up ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಅದೂ ಹೋಗಲಿ, ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಶೇಕಡ 5 ratio ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಹೋಗಬಾರದೆಂದರೂ, 25 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ $1\frac{1}{2}$ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ variation ಇದೆಯೆಂದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಶೇಕಡ 5 ಗಿಂತಲೂ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Variations include savings as well as excesses. Out of Rs. 27 crores, the actual is only 22 crores for the year 1950-51. So the net saving is Rs. 5 crores. It amounts to 20 per cent. So, if the plea of the Hon'ble Minister is that those variations are natural, we have suggested that it may be limited.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I was answering regarding the excess grant asked for, but not the savings effected.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—Since the Department did not maintain accounts and there was no control over the flow of expenditure.

> "In the case of loss, shortage etc., in the Food Department, the Committee observes that though on account of volume of transaction they could not have altogether avoided the amount of loss in several cases and they had not even purchased right type of stock and no action had been taken for effecttive check and fixing of responsibility on the supervisory staff."

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I have taken note of what he stated.

ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನನ್ನ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಧಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹುಚ್ಚಾಪಟ್ಟೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೌರವ ತರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂ.—ಗೌರವ ತರುವ statement ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. It is not a correct charge. I think these are uncalled for statements.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—There must be a responsible statement, and every statement, which has no responsibility, is dishonourable.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That is a very serious charge which we cannot

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

swallow and the Minister must be careful in the using of the words.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Absolutely I am careful.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I object to the use of such words.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—If he wants that word to be avoided, it does not refer to anybody. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಇದು 1950-51ರ ಲೆಕ್ಕ. ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಜ್ಞಾಪಕದಲ್ಲಿಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಿಟ್ಟು ನಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಆಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ criticismಗಳನ್ನು anticipate ಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೊಡನೆ ನಾವು ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅಕೌಂಟಂಗನ್ನು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಆಡಿಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸದ್ಯದಲ್ಲೇ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಇದೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಸರಿಹೋಗಬಹುದು.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. Departmental Headಗಳವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಮುತುವರ್ಜಿ ವಹಿಸಬೇಕು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

Pay and pension ಮೊಬಲಗು ಆ ವರ್ಷ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನೇಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ anticipate ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಆದುದು ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದ actualsನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅವರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ 2,500 ಜನರನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ದಿವಸ ರಿಟೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರಲ್ಲಾ, ಅದನ್ನು ನೀವು expect ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಿರಾ? ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದವರನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರಲ್ಲಾ, ಅವರನ್ನು rehabilitate ಮಾಡದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—1950-51ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯು ಇಂಟೆಗ್ರೇಷನ್ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವರ್ಷ. ರೈಲ್ವೆ ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಬಾಬುಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋದವು. ಆ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ accounting procedure ಮೂರು ಸಾರಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಯಿತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಜ್ಞಾಪಕದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ವಿಷಯ ದಿನಚರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಜ್ಞಾಪಕವಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾವೇನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

3 P.M.

ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಪೆನ್ಷನ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನಿನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಆ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ನಾನಾ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಹಣ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚಾದಂತೆ ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ 66 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಡೀಟ್ಯೈಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಆ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿರುವಂಥ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಪತ್ರಗಳ ತಪಶೀಲು ಸಮೇತ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇನ್ನು ತಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾದ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ದೊರಕಿರುತ್ತವೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,38,800 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Land Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall now put the other demands for excess grants to vote: The question is:

"That sums not exceeding the sums specified in the motion for grants for excess expenditure for the year 1950-51 and included in the list distributed to members be granted to Government to cover excess expenditure incurred over voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951 in respect of demands Nos. 4, 8, 9A, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33."

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by the Speaker motions for demands for grants to cover expenditure incurred in excess of voted grants for the year 1950-51 adopted are reproduced below].

DEMAND NO. 4.—SALES TAX, STAMPS AND REGISTRATION.

3 C. Sales Tax, 4. Stamps and 5. Registration.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,100 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Sales Tax, Stamps and Registration'."

DEMAND NO. 8.—MUZRAI INSTITUTIONS.

13. Muzrai Institutions.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 19,200 be granted to the

Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants the year ended 31st day of March 1951, during in respect of 'Muzrai Institutions'."

DEMAND NO. 9-A —PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES.

15. Pensions and Allowances.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,05,400 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Pensions and Allowances'."

DEMAND NO. 12.—COURTS OF LAW.

18. Courts of Law.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 73,100 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Courts of Law'."

DEMAND NO. 17.—IRRIGATION WORKS.

23. Irrigation Works.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 11,84,000 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Irrigation Works'."

DEMAND NO. 18.—CIVIL WORKS.

24. Civil Works.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,23,500 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

DEMAND NO. 19.—COMMUNICATIONS.

24-A. Communications.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,02,800 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Communications'."

DEMAND NO. 21.—AGRICULTURE AND ANIMAL HUSBANDRY.

27. Agriculture, 27-A. Animal Husbandry.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 34,64,300 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951,, in respect of 'Agriculture and Animal Husbandry'."

DEMAND NO. 22.—HORTICULTURE.

27-B Horticulture.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 90,100 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Horticulture'."

DEMAND NO. 25.—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS.

30. Grants for Public Improvements.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 12,800 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Grants for Public Improvements'."

DEMAND NO. 28—KRISHNARAJASAGAR IRRIGATION WORKS—2. WORKING EXPENSES.

XXV. Krishnarajasagar Irrigation Works—2. Working Expenses.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,10,800 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Krishnarajasagar Irrigation Works—2. Working Expenses'."

DEMAND NO. 29.—HYDRO-ELECTRIC WORKS.

XXV-A. Hydro-Electric Works.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 5,20,800 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure

(MR. SPEAKER.)

incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Hydro-Electric Works'."

DEMAND No. 30—IRON AND STEEL WORKS AND CEMENT PLANT—WORKING EXPENSES AND DEPRECIATION FUND.

XXVII. Iron and Steel Works and Cement Plant.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,24,600 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Iron and Steel Works and Cement Plant'."

DEMAND No. 31.—KOLAR GOLD FIELDS WATER WORKS—WORKING EXPENSES AND DEPRECIATION.

XXVIII. Kolar Gold Fields Water Works.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 13,600 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Kolar Gold Fields Water Works'."

DEMAND No. 32.—INDUSTRIAL WORKS—WORKING EXPENSES, ETC.

II Forest, (i) Sandal Oil Operation Expenses; and XXIX. Industrial Works—Working Expenses.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 61,04,800 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Industrial Works—Working Expeness'."

DEMAND No. 33.—CHAMARAJASAGAR WATER WORKS-WORKING EXPENSES, ETC.

XXX. Chamarajasagar and Water Works—Working Expenses.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 72,700 be granted to the Government to cover the excess expenditure incurred over the voted grants during the year ended 31st day of March 1951, in respect of 'Chamarajasagar Water Works—Working Expenses'."

Mr. SPEAKER.—*The House will adjourn now for Lunch and reassemble at Three Thirty.*

The House adjourned for Lunch at Three Minutes past Three of the Clock and met again at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Legislative Business.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The next item on the agenda is the Mysore Elementary Education (Amendment) Bill, 1955.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, I may be permitted to move the Mysore Weights and Measures (Amendment) Bill, 1954.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

MYSORE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider.

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Weights and Measures (Amendment) Bill, 1954, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this Bill is an amendment proposed for the existing Act now in force in the State, namely, the Mysore Weights and Measures Act, 1902. The objects and reasons for this Bill have been clarified in the Statement. The financial memorandum also has been appended along with the annexure giving copies of the Bills that are proposed to be amended and also the Bills that will have to be repealed after this Act comes into force. I will briefly state the reasons which prompted the Government to move this measure.